



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

needs of theological education in this country. He has, at least, furnished in outline an accurate and suggestive interpretation of the historical setting in which our theological work must be consciously placed. The evident mission of the book is to deliver us from the barren controversies which have so long diverted attention from the real issues, and to open our eyes to the actual problems which we must courageously meet.

**Jesus.** By Professor George H. Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1912. Pp. 321. \$1.50.

Fifteen years ago, while he was professor of New Testament interpretation at Chicago Theological Seminary, Dr. Gilbert published a *Student's Life of Jesus*. This book has been useful to many as a guide to fuller study of the gospels, and is now in its third edition. The author has continued his historical investigation of the gospels, however, and has reached a different view of the historical value of the sources of our knowledge of Jesus. This has necessitated a rewriting of his interpretation of Jesus' life. His two books are independent of each other, but both are actuated by the simple purpose to get at the facts and by an unchanged view of the greatness of Jesus and of the adequacy of his revelation to the needs of mankind. Dr. Gilbert hopes that this new exposition of Jesus may be of some service to the church in its present time of theological stress, for he is assured that nothing can so further the "Jesus-type" of religious life as an intelligent acquaintance with Jesus himself.

The book is in three parts, dealing with the sources, the historical Jesus, and the legendary Jesus.

His method of using the gospels as sources for ascertaining the life of Jesus is to take up, first, the material contained in Q (the Logia), as being the earliest and best attested narrative of Jesus; then, the additional material contained in the Gospel of Mark and reproduced in the First and Third gospels; and finally, the material in each of the Synoptic Gospels that is peculiar to itself. He thus has three strata of the memorabilia of Jesus, decreasing in historical trustworthiness in that order. With reference to the Gospel of John, which is dated at 100-120 A.D. and is not by the apostle John, Dr. Gilbert thinks certain features of the Johannine representation may have historical value, but "the author himself unmistakably puts us on our guard against accepting *any* statement in his writing as historical except on thorough investigation, and in this investigation the earliest documents imbedded in the Synoptic Gospels will always have a determinative influence" (p. 72).

Part II, setting forth the historical Jesus, has a long chapter on the Greco-Roman world in which Jesus' life was set, followed by a brief

consideration of the years before his public ministry, and of his entrance upon the ministry. An extended discussion on What Jesus Thought of Himself concludes with the view that "Jesus explicitly classed himself with the prophets and spoke of himself as a teacher," that he claimed to be Messiah but in a highly spiritualized non-popular sense, and "as to the nature of Jesus, whether it was different from that of other men, there is no evidence in our sources that this was ever the subject of remark or of reflection on his part" (p. 153). In further chapters he considers the main events and characteristics of the ministry to its close on the cross. "The career of Jesus as a character of history terminated at an unknown tomb near Jerusalem" (p. 236).

Part III contains seventy pages on the legendary Jesus. The birth and infancy of Jesus and the material resurrection are counted legendary. In the ministry itself Dr. Gilbert does not find much legendary material, and he thinks this remarkable in view of the extreme credulity and the love of the supernatural which characterized the age in which the gospel took shape. The Q source, or Logia, contains nothing which need be regarded as in any degree legendary. The Markan narrative contains perhaps no more than five incidents of a legendary character, namely, the stilling of the tempest, the feeding of the multitude, the walking upon the water, the transfiguration, and the voice from heaven in connection with it. For these events a natural explanation is offered. The peculiar material in the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John contains a large number of legendary narratives, but these are obviously non-historical. With regard to the resurrection it is said: "The church of the twentieth century is at one with the apostolic church in the belief that Jesus, having suffered death on the cross, *continued to live*; but the *grounds* of that belief which found a place in the gospel narrative cannot be regarded as valid. The abiding foundation of that belief is not material—an empty tomb, a reanimated physical body—but it is spiritual" (p. 307).

Dr. Gilbert has added to the many sincere attempts to reinterpret Jesus. His own theological and historical presuppositions are reflected in the book. The multiplicity and variety of the interpretations of Jesus now before the public enable us to see how difficult it is to arrive at a wholly objective and completely historical conception of Jesus' person and work. At the same time they promote the effort, and they lead toward its accomplishment.

**Greece and Babylon.** By Lewis R. Farnell. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. Pp. xii + 311.

The claim that ancient Greece borrowed many of her religious ideas from Babylonia

has been weighed and found wanting by Dr. Farnell, the learned author of *Cults of the Greek States* and other works on the religion of Greece.

One cannot show the thoroughness of Dr. Farnell's book better than by quoting, as far as possible, the author's own striking summaries.

After a statement of the problem and the evidence (chap. ii), the author takes up a discussion of the morphology of the compared religions (chap. iii), and finds that "we must regard the religious structure to which the cults of Anatolia and Mesopotamia belonged as morphologically the same as the Hellenic" (p. 40). The predominance of the goddess in the religions compared is taken up in chap. v. Here the comparison shows that the Hellenes did not bring with them into Greece the supremacy of the goddess, nor did they borrow it from the Semites (contrary to the opinion current among scholars long before pan-Babylonism was heard of), but found it on the soil, "a native growth of an old Mediterranean religion."

It is not, however, until the author compares the deities of the two civilizations (chaps. vi and vii), as nature-powers and as social powers, that the hopelessness of attempting to maintain that Greece borrowed from Babylon becomes evident. The Babylonian religion early took on an astral character, whereas the religion of the Hellenes "was pre-eminently concerned with mother-earth—with Ge-meter" (p. 114). Likewise the "political application of Hellenic religion seems wholly a native and independent product of the Hellenic spirit, and reflected the characteristically Hellenic forms of civic life" (p. 140).

Chap. ix treats of "Purity as a Divine Attribute." The mythology of the Babylonians is found to be strikingly pure. "It agrees in this respect with the Hebraic, and differs markedly from the Hellenic; the gods live in monogamic marriage with their respective goddesses, and we have as yet found no licentious stories of their intrigues" (p. 164). This is a very important point, for it is just the mythological stories of a people that are likely to be borrowed by others.

"Again, Babylonian magic is essentially demonic; but we have no evidence suggesting that the pre-Homeric Greek was demon-ridden, or that demonology and exorcism were leading factors of his consciousness and practice: the earliest mythology does not suggest that he habitually imputed his physical or moral disorders to demons, nor does it convey any hint of the existence in the early society of that terrible functionary, the witch-finder, or the institution of witch-trials" (p. 178).

The religious temperament of Greeks and Babylonians differed in many important points (chap. xi). The Semite lived in the fear of the Lord. "The religious habit of the Hellene strikes us by comparison as sober, well-tempered, often genial, never ecstatically abject, but even—we may say—self-respecting. Tears for sin,

lamentations and sighs, the countenance bowed to the ground, the body cleaving to the pavement, these are not part of his ritual" (pp. 192-93).

While the eschatological ideas of the East and West (chap. xii) are in some respects similar, "it is perhaps the most salient and significant difference between Hellenic and Mesopotamian religions that in the latter we have no trace of mysteries at all, while in the former not only were they a most potent force in the popular religion, but were the chief agents for developing the eschatologic faith" (p. 220).

The comparison of the ritual (chap. xiii) likewise shows many similarities between the two religions, but entirely too many striking differences to permit of the theory of borrowing.

#### Religious Liberty. By Francesco Ruffini.

Translated by J. Parker Heyes, with a preface by J. B. Bury. New York: Putnam, 1912. \$3.50.

This book deserves a long and discriminating review. The author is professor of ecclesiastical law in the University of Turin. His learning is prodigious, and it is evident on almost every page. But the inadequacy of translation is apparent in numerous passages where the meaning is left in doubt. Yet upon the whole the work can be understood, and it will have to be reckoned with by all students of religious liberty whether considered in its historical development or in its abstract conception.

Ruffini defines religious liberty as a judicial idea. "It takes sides neither with faith nor with disbelief; but in that ceaseless struggle which has been waged between them since man first existed, and which will be continued, perhaps, as long as man exists, it stands absolutely apart."

He believes in some kind of state ecclesiastical control. It is only in a state church that religious liberty is possible. Of course in a state church there should be no bar to the growth of denominations. They should be allowed freely to do their own work in their own way. But the very zeal that led to separation renders all separatists intolerant. This he attempts to prove from the history of religious liberty, and from the actual present status of the subject. For example: In Catholic Italy Luigi Luzzati, a Jew, was prime minister, whereas in separatist America a Catholic could never be president. But clearly he does not understand the situation in America. Theoretically there is nothing to keep a Catholic from becoming president, and practically the Catholics are finding representation in all the great public offices of the country. For example, the chief justice of the Supreme Court is a Catholic, and one of the associate justices is a Catholic, and all political parties